

## **REMARKS**

In view of the following remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection**

Claims 1-8, 10 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Nakano and Takashima. This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to independent claims 1 and 13-15 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites a content reproduction apparatus which reproduces a digital content. Further, claim 1 recites that the content reproduction apparatus includes (1) an instruction receiving unit that receives (from outside of the content reproduction apparatus) an instruction for outputting index information that indicates a device key. Moreover, claim 1 recites that the content reproduction apparatus includes (2) an index information output unit that outputs (via a video output unit connecting to a display apparatus that is distinct from the content reproduction apparatus) the index information that indicates the device key and that is converted by a video processing unit into a data format that is displayable on the screen of the display apparatus, such that the index information is output to the display apparatus based on the instruction received by the instruction receiving unit.

Independent claim 13 recites a related system, independent claim 14 recites a related method, and independent claim 15 recites a related computer-readable recording medium having a program recorded thereon.

Applicants respectfully submit that Nakano and/or Takashima fail to disclose or suggest above-mentioned distinguishing features (1) and (2) as recited in independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in related independent claims 13-15.

Initially, Applicants note that claim 1 recites that the index information indicates a device key. Further, Applicants note that the above-mentioned rejection relies on paragraph [0179] for teaching that the index information output unit outputs the index information indicating the device key, as recited in claim 1. However, paragraph [0179] of Nakano teaches that a key information generation unit 107 outputs a generated encrypted media key to a key information recording apparatus 200. This generated encrypted media key output by the information generation unit 107, as disclosed by Nakano, cannot be equated to the index information indicating the device key, as required by claim 1. Specifically, the claimed index information indicating the device key is completely different from the encrypted media key of Nakano.

Thus, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that paragraph [0179] of Nakano cannot be relied upon for disclosing that the index information output unit outputs the index information indicating the device key, as required by claim 1.

Rather, Applicants note that, the only feature of Nakano that could possibly be considered to be comparable to the claimed index information is the device key identification information (see paragraph [0094] of Nakano). Specifically, Nakano teaches that the device key identification information identifies the device keys, and that the device key identification and the device keys are output by a key management apparatus 100 and recorded onto recording apparatuses 300 and reproduction apparatuses 400 of the user apparatuses (see paragraphs [0094] and [0226], and Fig. 10, specifically steps S103, S104 and S111).

Thus, in view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the generated encrypted key, as disclosed by Nakano cannot be compared to the index information, as recited in claim 1, because the generated encrypted key does not identify the device key, as required by claim 1. Rather, the device key identification information is the only feature of Nakano that is comparable to the index information, as recited in claim 1.

As a result, it is clear that Nakano merely teaches that the user apparatus receives and records the device keys and the device key information, but fails to disclose or suggest that the index information output unit outputs (via a video output unit connecting to a display apparatus that is distinct from the content reproduction apparatus) the index information that indicates the device key and that is converted into a data format that is displayable on the screen of the display apparatus, such that the index information is output to the display apparatus based on the instruction received by the instruction receiving unit, as recited in claim 1.

In other words, Nakano merely teaches that the key management apparatus outputs the device key identification information to the recording/reproduction apparatuses, but fails to disclose or suggest that the index information indicating the device key is converted to a format that is displayable on a screen of the display apparatus and is output to a display apparatus that is distinct from the content reproduction apparatus, as required by claim 1.

Now turning to Takashima, which was relied upon for teaching the claimed instruction receiving unit (see page 5 of the Office Action), the Applicants note that Takashima merely teaches selecting content that is subject to reproduction based on an input from a user (see paragraphs [0105], [0437] and [0457]).

Thus, in view of the above, it is apparent that Takashima merely teaches that content to be reproduced is selected based on an input from a user, but fails to disclose or suggest that the

instruction receiving unit receives an instruction for outputting index information that indicates a device key, as required by claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claims 1 and 13-15 and claims 2-8 and 10 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from the any combination of Nakano and Takashima.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Nakano and/or Takashima or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakano and/or Takashima to obtain the invention of independent claim 1 and 13-15. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 13-15 and claims 2-8 and 10 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the above remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaoru YOKOTA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2009.10.05 12:43:47 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap  
Registration No. 60,554  
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
October 5, 2009